MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION				
Type of Requestor: (x) HCP () IE () IC	Response Timely Filed? (x) Yes () No			
Requestor's Name and Address Vista Medical Center Hospital	MDR Tracking No.: M4-03-7583-01			
4301 Vista Road	TWCC No.:			
Pasadena, Texas 77504	Injured Employee's Name:			
Respondent's Name and Address Houston ISD	Date of Injury:			
P O Box 162443 Westlake Station	Employer's Name: Houston ISD			
Austin, Texas 78716 Box 42	Insurance Carrier's No.: HISD0001594200			

PART II: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS

Dates of Service		CPT Code(s) or Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due	
From	То	- Cr r Code(s) or Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due	
07/19/02	07/24/02	Surgical Admission	\$20,893.83	\$0.00	

PART III: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

"According to the literal interpretation of TWCC Rule 134.401 and the further clarification by the TWCC from QRL 01-03, a Carrier may not 'deduct' any carve-out costs listed in Rule 134.401(c)(4). Further, additional reimbursement for implants or any other 'carve-out costs' shall only be reimbursed at cost plus 10% if the stop-loss threshold is NOT met. Therefore, in this instance, the Carrier has severely under-reimbursed the billed charges, despite the clear language in the Texas Administrative Codes and further clarification by the TWCC in QRL 01-03."

PART IV: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

"Based on the performed procedure, as well as the length of stay under the Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guidelines, the requestor invoked the Stop-Loss provision of Commission Rule 134.401 and sought reimbursement of \$83,306.29. The insurer properly paid \$35,523.83 based on the documentation submitted by the Provider, and correctly coded its denial "F"-reduced per Fee Guidelines. As the Provider has failed to document exactly how or why the services it provided were unusually extensive or costly, it is due no further reimbursement."

PART V: MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY, AND/OR EXPLANATION

This dispute relates to inpatient services provided in hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Rule 134.401 (Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline). The hospital has requested additional reimbursement according to the stop-loss method contained in that rule. Rule 134.401(c)(6) establishes that the stop-loss method is to be used for "unusually costly services." The explanation that follows this paragraph indicates that in order to determine if "unusually costly services" were provided, the admission must not only exceed \$40,000 in total audited charges, but also involve "unusually extensive services."

After reviewing the information provided by both parties, it does **not** appear that this particular admission involved "unusually extensive services." Accordingly, the stop-loss method does not apply and the reimbursement is to be based on the per diem plus carve-out methodology described in the same rule. The operative report indicates that an anterior cervical interbody arthrodesis was performed. The operative report indicates there were no problems noted and the patient was transferred to the recovery room in satisfactory condition.

The carrier made reimbursement based on per diem and carve out of the implantables (5 day stay and cost plus ten percent for the implantables, bringing the total amount of reimbursement to \$35,523.83). The provider did not submit any invoices indicating the amount billed for the implantables. Therefore, MDR cannot determine the cost of the implantables and no additional reimbursement is recommended.

Therefore, based on the facts of this situation, the parties' positions, and the application of the provisions of Rule 134.401(c), we find that the health care provider is not entitled to an additional reimbursement.					
р					
PART VI: COMMISSION DECISION					
Based upon the review of the disputed healthcare services, the Medical Review Division has determined that the requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement. Ordered by:					
•	Michael Bucklin	06/07/05			
Authorized Signature	Typed Name	Date of Order			
PART VII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST A HEARING					
Either party to this medical dispute may disagree with all or part of the Decision and has a right to request a hearing. A request for a hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the TWCC Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk within 20 (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision (28 Texas Administrative Code § 148.3). This Decision was mailed to the health care provider and placed in the Austin Representatives box on This Decision is deemed received by you five days after it was mailed and the first working day after the date the Decision was placed in the Austin Representative's box (28 Texas Administrative Code § 102.5(d)). A request for a hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk, 7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100, Austin, Texas, 78744 or faxed to (512) 804-4011. A copy of this Decision should be attached to the request. The party appealing the Division's Decision shall deliver a copy of their written request for a hearing to the opposing party involved in the dispute. Si prefiere hablar con una persona in español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.					
PART VIII: INSURANCE CARRIER DELIVI	ERY CERTIFICATION				
I hereby verify that I received a copy of this Decision and Order in the Austin Representative's box.					
Signature of Insurance Carrier:		Date:			